FREE SOCIETY

A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK AND LITERATURE.

VOL. Xb. NO. 2. CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JANUARY 10, 1904. WHOLE NO. 448.

Courage, Free Heart.

Courage, free heart, amidst the battle here;
Ever its winter season hath the year.
Courage, free heart, and press on without fear;
At last the flowered springtime will appear.
Courage, free heart!

Courage, free heart, and fail not in the fight;
The day is struggling in the bonds of night.
Courage, free heart, and dare all in thy might;
The hours are counted that shall bring the light.
Courage, free heart!

Courage, free heart, and let deed follow deed;
Slow is the increase of the long-sown seed.
Courage, free heart, and no forebodings heed;
The harvest days will come and give their meed.
Courage, free heart!

Courage, free heart, and think not of the pain;
The winds and waves have strength upon the main.
Courage, free heart; treat danger with disdain;
The ship at last shall its safe harbor gain.
Courage, free heart!

Courage, free heart, and be thou true and strong;
The things are many that would work thee wrong.
Courage, free heart, and meet thy foes in throng;
For thou shalt win, and sing the victor's song.
Courage, free heart!

—William Francis Barnard.

—— o ——

"Too Philosophical."

"You are too abstract!" This is an objection frequently raised against the Anarchists by many people. They say that since we address ourselves to the workers we should make more fruitful propaganda if we would take up less elevated subjects. By the preceding chapters we have seen that it is the development of the ideas themselves which has drawn us into the treatment of questions not always within the scope of those whom we address; this is a fatality to which we submit and against which we can do nothing. To those who are just beginning to nibble at the social question our writings may often appear dry; this we do not deny. But can we alter the fact that the questions which we treat and which must be treated, are dry in themselves? Can we prevent the principles which we defend, linked together as they are, identified with every branch of human knowledge, from leading those who wish to elucidate them to study things they did not before deem necessary? And, moreover, has not all this preparatory work to which they would condemn us, been already performed by our predecessors, the Socialists? Do not the capitalistic classes themselves work for the demolition of their society? Are not all ambitious radicals, Socialists more or less deeply dyed, bent upon demonstrating to the workers that the present society can do nothing for them; that it must be changed?

The Anarchists therefore have only to analyze this enormous work, to coordinate it, to extract its essence. Their role is limited to proving that it is not by changing governors that the ills from which we suffer may be cured; that it is not by merely modifying the machinery of the social organism that we shall prevent it from producing those evil effects which the very bourgeois, desirious of getting into power, knows so well how to show up. But our task is complicated precisely because the ideas which we advocate are abstract. If, indeed, we were willing to content ourselves with declamations and assertions, the task would be rendered easy, both for us and for our readers. The more difficult the problems to be solved the more need is there to acquaint ourselves with arguments and logic. It is easy to say and write, "Comrades, the bosses rob us! The bourgeoisie are drunkards! Rulers are scoundrels! We must rebel, kill the capitalists, set fire to the factories!" Moreover, before any one wrote it the exploited had sometimes killed their exploiters, the governed had revolted, the poor had rebelled against the rich; yet the situation was in nowise altered. They had changed rulers. In 1789 property changed hands; subsequently the people revolted, hoping thereby to force it to change hands again. Yet the governing continued to oppress the governed, the rich continued to live at the expense of the exploited; nothing was altered. Since it was written the people have likewise revolted, and nothing is altered. Hence it is not a question of saying or writing that the laborer is exploited; it is necessary to explain to him above all how in changing masters he does not cease to be exploited, and how, were he to put himself in his master's place, he would in turn become an exploiter, leaving behind him the exploited who would then make against him the same complaints he now makes against those he would like to have dispossessed. It is necessary to make him understand further how the capitalistic classes have interested him in the existing society, persuaded him to defend the privileges of his exploiters while he believes himself defending his own interests in an organization which, in fact, has nothing for him but promises never to be realized.

By its organization, based upon the antagonism of interests, our bourgeois society charges itself with the task of bringing the workers to a revolution. Now, the workers have always made revolutions, but have forever allowed the benefits thereof to be juggled away, because they "did not know." The role of the propagandist, then, is to teach the workers; and to teach them one must give demonstrations to them. Assertion makes believers, but not conscious ones. At the time when, even for the most advanced Socialists, authority was the basis of all organization, there was nothing wrong in having mere believers. On the contrary it facilitated the task of those who set themselves up as directors. One could go ahead with assertions; one was believed according to the degree of authority he had been clever enough to acquire; and as the directors did not exact of their proselytes a knowledge of why they were to act, but only to "believe" strongly enough to make them blindly obey received orders, they had no need of killing themselves to furnish arguments. Believing in providential men who were to think and act for them, the mass of proselytes did not need to learn much. Had not the leaders a plan of social organization already prepared in their heads, which they would hasten to execute once they were carried into power? To know how to fight and kill each other, that was all they asked the common herd to know and to do. The leaders once in power, the dear people had nothing to do but wait; everything would come to them at the proper time without their troubling themselves about it.

But anarchistic principles have come to overthrow all this. Denying the necessity of providential men, making war upon authority, and claiming for each individual the right and the duty to act under the pressure of his own impulses only, of submitting to no constraint or restriction of his autonomy; proclaiming individual initiative as the basis of all progress and of every truly libertarian association, Anarchism cannot content itself with making believers; it must, above all, aim to convince, that its converts may know why they believe, that the arguments with which they have been furnished may have struck home, that they may have weighed, discussed and considered the value of these for themselves. Hence a propaganda more difficult, more arduous, more abstract, but also more effective.

From the moment the individual relies solely on his own initiative, he must be enabled to exercise it effectively. That such initiative may adapt itself freely to the ac.

tion of other individuals, it must be conscious, reasoned, based upon the logic of the natural order of facts. That all these separate acts may converge to a common end, they must be animated by a common idea, well understood and clearly elaborated; whence it follows that nothing but a close, logical, and thoroly defined discussion of the principles can open the minds of those who adopt them, and lead such to reflect for themselves. Hence our method of procedure, which, instead of causing us to get a lot of rhetorical fireworks out of any idea we take up, leads us to turn it over in all its aspects, to dissect it, even to its final atoms, in order to extract from it the greatest possible amount of argument. . .

When a question, however abstract it may be, presents itself to the investigations of the Anarchist propagandist, he cannot make it otherwise than abstract; nor can he pass it by in silence, under the pretext that those to whom he speaks have never heard of it. To explain it in plain, clear, precise, and concise language; to avoid "thousand-legged words," as one of our comrades puts it,—that is words which are understood only by the initiated;—to avoid burying one's thought in high-flown and redundant phraseology, or seeking after phrases and effects,—this is all that can be done by those who have it at heart to propagate the principles, to spread them and make them understood among the masses; but we cannot mutilate them with the excuse that they are not accessible to the people. If it were necessary to evade every question which the majority of readers are not able to understand upon first enunciation, we shonld be condemned to return to declamation, to the art of stringing out meaningless phrases one after the other, and saying nothing. This role is too well played by the bourgeois rhetoricians for us to attempt to supersede them in it. If the workers want to emancipate themselves they must understand that this emancipation will not come of itself; that they must obtain it; and that self-education is one of the forms of his social struggle. The possibility and the continuance of their exploitation by the capitalistic class proceed from their ignorance. They must know how to free themselves intellectually if they wish to be able to free themselves materially. If they already recoil before the difficulties of mental emancipation, which depends solely upon their own willingness, what then will it be before the difficulties of a more active struggle in which it will be necessary to expend an altogether incommensurate force of character and amount of will! Useless and injurious as it is, the bourgeoisie has nevertheless succeeded in concentrating in the brains of a few all the scientific knowledge necessary to the present development of humanity. If we do not want the revolution to be a step backward, the worker must be able intellectually to replace the bourgeoisie which he wishes to overthrow; his ignorance must not be an obstacle to the development of sciences already acquired. If he does not know them thoroly he must be able to comprehend them when he finds himself in their presence.

To be sure we quite understand all this impatience; we can imagine that those who are hungry would like to see the dawning of the day when they will be able to appease their hunger; we are perfectly aware that those who submit to the yoke of authority only by suppressing their anger, are impatient to shake it off, desirous of listening to words in conformity with their condition of mind, reminding them of their hatreds, their desires, their aspirations, their thirst for justice. But however great this impatience, however legitimate the demands and the need of realizing them, the idea advances only by degrees, penetrates the mind and lodges there only when matured and elaborated. When we consider that the bourgeoisie which we wish to overthrow took centuries of preparation before it overturned the royalty, it should cause us to reflect upon the work of elaboration which we have to do. In the fourteenth century, when Etienne Marcel attempted to seize the power for the benefit of the bourgeoise, already organized in corporations, the bourgeois class already felt itself to be strong; for a long time it had been aspiring to authority and had organized itself for that purpose, had educated and developed itself, had worked for its enfranchisement by endeavoring to obtain from the baronage the freedom of the communes. It was not, however, till four centuries later that it succeeded in winning the long-coveted boon.

Assuredly we hope not to have to wait so long for our enfranchisement and the overthrow of capitalistic exploitation. Its complete collapse at the end of so short a period of power is hurrying it on to a speedy fall. Yet if the bourgeoisie was able in 1789 to substitute itself for "divine right," it was because it had prepared itself intellectually for such substitution; and the more rapid the downfall the more haste should we workers make to prepare ourselves intellectually, not to replace the power which we must destroy but to organize ourselves so as to prevent any aristocrocy's substituting itself for that which has given way. The idea of free individual initiative once being established, people should be enabled (we cannot repeat it too often) to learn how to reason and to combine their initiative. If they have not the will to deliver themselves from their own ignorance, how will they be able to make others understand when they themselves have not been able to learn? Let us have no fear, then, of discussing the most abstract questions; each solution obtained is a step forward on the pathway of emancipation. Leaders being discarded, the knowledge hitherto in their possession must be diffused among the masses; and there is but one means of bringing it within their reach, which is, that, while continuing to go forward we persuade them to interest themselves in questions which interest us. Once more: Let us make ourselves as clear as possible; but let us not mutilate ourselves, for then, instead of going forward we should go backward,—truly a queer way of understanding progress.—From "Moribund Society and Anarchy," Jean Grave.

—— o ——

Did the mass of men know the actual selfishness and injustice of their rulers, not a government would stand a year; the world would ferment with Revolution.—Parker.

Echos from Behind the Bars.

Occasionally an echo from the eastern side of the Alleghany mountains reaches me, and reminds me of years gone by, spent in a white-washed cell six by nine feet, facing the Ohio river. There it was, with plenty of time to spare, when Alexander Berkmann and I started to give each other our best and innermost ideas on various subjects under the title "Zuchthausbluethen" (Prison Blossoms), written on scraps of paper which we sometimes had to procure in most difficult ways. These writings were a source of pleasure to us, who, tho in one building but in different cells, had no other way of communicating with each other. The "International" was another publication on the line of "Prison Blossoms," written outside of prison and circulating only among a few selected friends. This is what Berkmann had in mind when he wrote the following lines:

"Dear old Chum,—One has to be in the right mood to appreciate properly an 'International.' For months past, I have been fighting the demons of the 'land of Indigo,' but today I settled down to a quiet perusal of several of your recent letters, among them the 'International' edition. The 'last of the Mohicans' called back to my mind a picture of 'better prison days,' distant echoes of 'Prison Blossoms,' visions of happy coupled 'skiffing' on the Ohio, the music serenading you on the eve of your local departure,—all so near, and yet so far,—and both in a double sense, the vice versa of our contrasted positions. My mind's eye wanders down the uneven steps of time's ladder, and I am back again in the years of my youth, reciting in the synagogue the new years,' with their ever-recurring sacred and inspiring refrain: 'Next year in Jerusalem!' How my devout childish heart thrilled with the awe and hope inspiring thought, the sure promise of the near national resurrection,—how my heart beat in the conscious pride of being a scion of the house of David, an heir in the kingdom of the divinely selected, and what passionate fervor I poured into that last hope of a universally persecuted race: 'Next year in Jerusalem!' Ah, the sublimity, the peace that passeth understanding of a child's undoubting faith and unwavering hope! But the years passed, and the new Zion still remained a sacred vision, a broken heart's cry, and, with growing years, the promised land of milk and honey seemed to be receding even farther, and divine hopes began to melt in the fires of human doubt. And now again the old sacred refrain wills up in my heart, and with new-born fervor I whisper the hope: 'Next year in Jerusalem!' The child is long dead, the man is full-grown; visions of Zion have died with the child and both are buried in the past, and the disillusioned man stands on the ashes of the dead; and yet the man, son of the child, sees visions, too; the Pandora hand of life beckons to him, as it did to the man, and once more the man is the child, fervently embracing sweet visions of hope and new life. May the new hopes for the resurrection of the man prove more real than the child's visions of a resurrected nation.

"Well, my dear Carolus, today is only December the 15th, but the breath of the yet un-

born year is already upon me, and as I may not be able to write to you again before new year, I will tell you "in strict confidence" that on January 1, 1904, I will dance a jig and a song with the happy refrain; 'Next year home!'"

(A new law, made some four years ago in Pennsylvannia, gives the prisoners almost twice as much commutation for good behavior as they got formerly. Thus B.'s sentence of twenty-one years penitentiary expires in July 1905, but there still remains a one year workhouse sentence for carrying concealed weapons. Having discussed this point with several friends and afterwards with him, he gives the following answer):

"Yes, alas! for the perversity of fate, or the powers that be; the 'home' is not to be taken literally; for tho I may say farewell to local friends, it will be merely to renew old acqaintances in the workhouse. Apropos, judging from all I hear, 'tis a step from purgatory into hell, but sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. That reminds me that St—— has received the impression from your letters that money could save me the visit to that pleasant home, which may be true; but it would require a fatter purse than we can command. Let me remark, in passing, that I shall positively refuse to sanction any attempt on the part of our friends to save me this trip. Having almost served a twenty-one years' sentence, I am in no mood to accept alleged "favors" from my friend, the enemy. If I could have a "pardon" by the mere winking of one eye, I would decline with thanks. As to the workhouse, I understand it is a regular inferno; furthermore, they allow there but two months on the first year; but as my first year in the workhouse will also be the last year of my sentence, I shall insist on five months good time, according to the provisions of the last commutation law; if I have a few dollars to throw away (by that time), I shall have our former lawyer start habeas corpus proceedings, after I have served seven months in the workhouse and thus force a final decision as to whether I am entitled to two or five months' good time on my last year."

Alexander Berkmann, having now spent spent over eleven years in prison, is now, at the age of thirty-three, no more the vigorous youth of 1892—physically he is on the decline, yet mentally he is brighter than ever. Hope, the best and truest friend of every prisoner,—hope to outlive the sentence will brace him up that he may return from the smaller into the larger—insane asylum.

Evoc, friend of "my better days"!

C. N.

—— o ——

Confusion and Communism.

The extent to which consistency demands and deserves our attention has been a matter of considerable interesting discussion in the pages of FREE SOCIETY of late, and the difficult problem has been looked at from a variety of ways; let us hope to the advantage of many inquiring minds. Among those who have written at length with respect to obtaining a linotype for the benefit of the paper, no one has shown a greater interest in this problem of consistency than Jay Fox, whose two articles are attempts to give a practical turn to Anarchist propaganda without sacrificing the essential elements of Anarchist Communism.

But, as often happens, a man's ideas may be defficient in just the elements which he insists upon as fundamental to consistency, a curious perversity of viewpoint or judgment leading him far afield when he thinks that he is very near the truth and wisdom. Jay Fox desires to see group propaganda established, but in his desires as expressed in his writings there is apparent a confusion, a contradiction which at times amounts to positive incoherence and chaos. Our friend's plan is to have "supervision" by a group play a part in the literary propaganda of the movement, he having given reasons for this desire which will be more or less satisfactory according to the feelings and convictions of his readers; in the explanation of that plan he errs, firstly, in speaking of it alternately as in harmony with Anarchist Communism and with the exact opposite of Anarchist Communism, viz., the economic conditions which we labor under today; and secondly, he errs in assuming that "supervision" in the sense in which he uses the word, can be anarchistic. The effect is that, as S. T. Byington recently pointed out in *Liberty*, a confusion results with respect to what Anarchists Communism stands for as a theory of society and a means to social health. We must be clear and definite in our theories or else we lay ourselves open, and justly, to suspicion in respect to what we have to offer to the world as wisdom and truth.

In his second article Comrade Fox says:

> I tried to show that the ends we seek would be best served by a closer adhesion in our practice to the theories we preach.

How far he is clear in this matter may be seen when, on turning to his first article, we find him saying, something quite different, viz.,—

> . . . While living under the present system we are forced, to a large extent, to use its methods whether we like them or not,—

and justifying the implied inconsistency. In his first article, immediately following the above, we find our comrade speaking of the "jurisdiction" which he would have a group exercise in respect to literary propaganda, as a thing—

> . . . casting over the whole the sweet flavor of Anarchist Communism.

Turning to his second article again, we find our propagandist saying, after he has expressed an opinion in favor of the right of a group to "supervise" an editor out of his chair if it pleases that group:

> Now I fancy that, with the limited opportunities which the present society affords, some such "supervision" as the latter proposition will be necessary. Whatever our ideals may be as to the conduct of a similar enterprise in a free society is quite another thing.

Note the "*quite another thing*"! Turning to his first article once more, and for the last time, to make "confusion worse confounded," our eyes fall upon these words, following a passage in which a scheme of group management of a paper is set forth:

> . . . But such an enterprise, to arrest the general interest of the comrades, must be conducted upon a basis in harmony with the ideal of Anarchist Communism.

In these passages Comrade Fox has made one thing perfectly clear, and that is that he is *not* clear as to the essential spirit of Anarchist Communism. In earnest, and as full of enthusiasm for the good of the movement as he is, he is as surely confused as to the question of what is or is not consistent as anarchist method or practise. Two articles containing more mutually contradictary utterances and assumptions it would be hard to find, and it is in order for our friend to extricate himself from the web in which he has unconsciously become entangled, and begin over again the work which he set himself to do in his observations on the linotype plan.

I have said that our comrade erred in two ways. His second offense is that he believes that the power of a group to rule an editor and displace him if it wishes is compatible with Anarchist Communism. Government by a group is as much government as government by an individual is, and Comrade Fox is neither anarchistic nor communistic when he favorably pictures a group saying to an editor in engaging him:

> . . . We will not exercise a censorship over what you may write or publish, but we retain the right to remove you upon due notice whenever for any reason you fail to give the desired satisfaction, or whenever we shall have secured the services of someone else who, in our judgment, is better qualified to fill the position you now hold.

Communist Anarchism is voluntary in all its comings and goings, the power of any one over another beginning and ending with the right to withdraw from his society if we do not like it. If we "supervise" a man we sacrifice our Anarchism, if we introduce other than voluntary elements into our lives we sacrifice our Communism.

I am not discussing the merits of consistency here, I am only trying to make clear what departs from and what approches consistency. The value of group propaganda is undeniable, and a group coming together for the purpose of supporting a paper is acting consistently and with expedience as well. Let a group collect money to support a paper now existing or that may exist; let the one best qualified by judgement and literary power take the editorial chair; let the paper be sent out; let subscribers be obtained; let the members of the group realize that no paper can infallibly please all at once; let the members of the group withhold their support individually and collectively if they are dissatisfied with the conduct of the paper; let the editor, as he probably will, resign, as support is largely withdrawn from him, and subscribers refuse the paper; let the group substitute freedom for supervision, and in the last resort start another paper rather than introduce government in the propaganda; and then, and then only will there be an approach to that consistency which Comrade Fox so cherishes; and then will the literary part of the propaganda be "casting over the whole the sweet flavor of Anarchist Communism." W. F. BARNARD.

—— o ——

For Chicago.

The twenty-fifth anniversary of *Freiheit*, the indefatigable champion of freedom, will be celebrated in Chicago Sunday, Jan. 17, 3 p. m. at 55 N. Clark St. All friends of liberty who appreciate the perseverance and vigor with which Comrade Most has been fighting for freedom are cordially invited to attend. Admission 10 cents.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by.....A. ISAAK.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 407 PARK AVE., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago post office as second-class matter, October 29, 1901.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors.

ANARCHY—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JANUARY 10, 1904.

448

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, your subscription expires with this number.

Notes.

Friends are requested to give us the names of persons who are likely to be interested in FREE SOCIETY, that we may send them sample copies.

* * *

Subscribers of FREE SOCIETY who are in arrears should not let the holiday festivals make them forget to renew their subscriptions. Send in your renewal now; it is the best Christmas present you can make to the paper.

* * *

To anyone sending us $2 we will send FREE SOCIETY one year and Dr. Greer's "A Physician in the House" or his new work "The Wholesome Woman." Also to anyone sending us one new subscriber and $2 we will send the same. This applies to renewals as well as new subscriptions.

* * *

The delinquent subscribers in New York will do us a great favor by paying their subscriptions to M. Maisel, 194 E. B'way. If the number on your wrapper is less than the whole number as shown in the current issue, you are in arrears. If you have not time to spare to see Comrade Maisel, write him a postal card and he will go and get the money.

—o—

For Chicago.

Under the auspices of the Sociological League, a newly-formed Chicago society, W. F. Barnard will deliver a course of twelve lectures during the winter. A successor of the Philosophical Society on a somewhat different plan, this organization has taken the commodious Jefferson Hall, Fraternity Bldg., 70 Adams St., between State & Dearborn Sts., where the lectures will be given on Sunday evenings at 8 p. m. Admission 10 cents.

Jan. 10—"Single Tax and Socialism."

—o—

For Boston.

Comrades and readers of Free Society interested in the local propaganda work and the re opening of the Social Science Club are invited to meet in Mikols's Tailor shop, 44 Roylston St., on Sunday, Jan. 10, at 3 p. m.

—o—

Hoarded wealth is wrested wealth. B.

Parry and Thrust.

Obedience is a poor man's virtue.

* * *

The price of liberty is understanding.

* * *

Political Socialism is handcuffed Socialism.

* * *

Supreme courts are not supreme in wisdom.

* * *

All "grafters" are strong believers in government.

* * *

Punishment will not give fire victims back their lives.

* * *

Those who destroyed 598 lives were not Anarchists; no, not at all.

* * *

Laws can do no more than make us cowards. Reason makes us men.

* * *

The Iroquois fire horror cannot hide that greater horror, the labor horror.

* * *

Those whom only death can silence will preserve free speech if it is threatened.

* * *

The garrot has displaced the water cure in the Philippines. American progress!

* * *

Edward Everett Hale has put the capsheaf upon his apostacy from truth in becoming chaplain of the United States Senate.

* * *

The British newspapers are suspicious of Roosevelt. Who is there beside Roosevelt himself who is not suspicious of this State on legs.

* * *

The people make no wars; but governments give the people the "glory" of making war and take for themselves the—profits.

* * *

The Chicago *American* wants some theatre managers hanged "as the Anarchists were hanged." The theatre managers are not worrying.

* * *

If Japan goes to war with Russia patriotism will be vindicated anew; but patriotism is hideous race hatred however often it is vindicated.

* * *

The "law" allowed Chicago theatres to remain open when they were all admittedly unsafe. It was a fire, not the law which closed them.

* * *

Single Taxers accept rent, interest and profit. What then do they oppose? Taking too much rent, taking too much interest, taking too much profit?

* * *

Many officials of Chicago, including the mayor, are threatened with or are threatening others with arrest. Does this prove that officials secure obedience to the laws of the land?

* * *

The miners in Colorado are appealing for law and order, and mine owners too have made the same appeal. With both sides willing why do law and order hang back? Because law is never found with order.

* * *

Ex-attorney general Eugene Engely, of Colorado, is under arrest for the offense of trying to aid the miners, and as a result of the governor declaring martial law in San Miguel County. Engley knows something of Anarchism; he will now have an opportunity to ponder it well and test its teachings by his own experience.

* * *

The president's latest message says nothing about the attacks upon him made by senators Hoar and Morgan, who have exposed the wiley Theodore as the stealer of Panama; nor does it mention the Turner outrage, which is now a public matter. Silence is the best refuge for the guilty.

* * *

The "citizens'" movement for the suppression of crime in Chicago is a confession that laws and ordinances, tho backed up by courts, police, and jails, are inoperative. If the infatuated "citizens" who are bent on removing crime while leaving crime's causes intact, would spend a little time in studying this fact, they might save their dollars and their dunce-heads at the same time.

* * *

Herbert N. Casson, writing in the Chicago *Un-American*, indulges his silly soul in the belief that Anarchists write and think as children do, or would, on the subject of restraint. Of course it was only Christ who said, "Except ye become as little children ye shall in nowise enter into the kingdom of heaven." But it is pertinent to ask the hysterical Herbert to prove that restraint really accomplishes anything good.

* * *

The steel trust has cut the wages of 25,000 men practically in half and will calmly pocket the blackmail which it has thus secured as additional "profit." All over the country similar attacks upon workmen are being made, doubtless in the hope of intimidating organized labor. Will the plan succeed? No doubt the administration at Washington has a hand in the thing. The voter must be kept quiet and in line. The answer of labor to all this will sooner or later be the general strike.

* * *

Those who observe the break up of the present conditions of sex relationship, are, many of them, more anxious to know what is "going to become of the children born" than they are to know why these conditions are breaking up. The fact is that maternal instinct, with paternal, is fairly effective now in spite of the revelations of the divorce courts, "free unions," and the records of abandonment. The widespread dissatisfaction with all forms of marriage is a significant fact which no amount of sentiment or fear can help us long to ignore. Let us face it. As libertarians let us face it, and understand it.

* * *

No more positive proof of the futility of government as an agent for good is needed than that furnished by the Iroquois theatre disaster. Open defiance of a number of city

ordinances, a defiance connived at by public officials—this is the damning evidence which usurps the name of order. And what do the officials propose to do in view of the facts? "Punish the guilty!" Lack of support has closed the theatres, but a cheap mayor, fleeing from the evidenee of his own shameful connivance, orders them closed as tho it were necessary for him to act. The lives of six hundred people laid upon the pyre of murder accuse the law and the makers of the law. The pretended haste to punish is a contemptible mockery. Law is not only a farce; it is a crime.

AMERICUS.

—o—

By the Wayside.

The Socialist mayor of Sheboygan, Wis., who was to throttle the dragon of capitalism, being invited to appear before the Socialist executives, "to account for his betrayal of Socialist principles and un-socialistic actions," replied that under no circumstances would he appear before the executives, for they were "a lot of cranks" who ought to be in the penitentiary. "Vote the Socialist ticket," boys, and the officials will certainly solve the social problem for—themselves!

* * *

The Chicago authorities are in vain looking for the guilty parties who caused the horrible catastrophe at the Iroquois theatre, altho the real "criminal" lies at their threshold, and his name is Commercialism. Almost all mine disasters, railway collisions, theatre catastrophies, etc., can be attributed to the system of commercialism and greed. Let commercialism and private property in the natural resources and means of production be eliminated and theatres will no longer be deathtraps.

* * *

"Trades unions have greviously disappointed the unprejudiced friends of organized labor by their failure to curb with a strong hand violence committed by their members," laments the *Daily News*. But the editor entirely overlooks the fact that even this republic has no less disappointed the unprejudiced friends of "a government of the people" by its complete failure to curb with a strong hand injustice, exploitation, and the barbarities now perpetrated in Colorado by the money-kings and its satellites, theg overnment officials. Why should violence be monopolized by government?

* * *

When Judge Gary sixteen years ago deliberately murdered five men because they loved their fellow men, by instructing the jury to the effect that the Anarchists who had advised violence were as guilty as those who had indulged in it, it was prophesied that the precedent thus established would sooner or later recoil upon the labor movement in general if labor should fail to protest against the fiendish interpretation of law. But the apathy of organized labor could not be changed to activity, and today the lash is upon its back. Indictments after indictments are being made by the grand jury holding the unions and its leaders responsible for any violence an individual member commits.

* * *

The *Freiheit*, or rather Comrade John Most and his many friends, is now celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the propaganda work he has accomplished in this country, and he can certainly with pride look back upon the past. Neither persecution nor imprisonment, nor the opposition and hatred of those for whom he entered the battle against tyranny and exploitation, have been able to break down his rebellious spirit and the enthusiasms with which he approached the social arena to combat oppression and darkness. His original language, altho often rough, was understood by those who are fleeced by the idlers, whose life is drudgery and worry. And undaunted as ever he swings the cudgel against tyranny and exploitation, and even from his enemies he has wrested admiration and respect for his sincerity and perseverence. And the rebels all over the world love him and wish that he may continue to awaken the dormant slaves from their lethargy and indolence. Like all of us, he has his faults and is often prejudiced against new theories of social life, as against the question of sex freedom, of which he cannot speak without getting into a frenzy; yet I clasp his hand and wish he may live and fight for many years to come.

* * *

Even in Germany, where the "revolutionary" Socialist leaders have declared the general strike to be a "general stupidity," it begins to dawn upon some prominent Socialists that the greatest strength of the wage workers lies in the economic field. In the *Neue Zeit*, one of the leading journals, a writer points out that the general strike is the most powerful means of defying the guns and rifles of the powers that be. But not as a means to free workmen from exploitation and wage slavery does he advocate the general strike, but to maintain the political privileges they now enjoy if governments should attempt to curtail the rights of suffrage. *O Sancta Simplicitas*!

* * *

In the next number of the same periodical another Socialist, Vliegen, who officially participated in the last general strike in Holland, repudiates the general strike idea entirely, for the reason that the worker is poor and cannot afford to pay exhorbitant prises for food during the time of a general strike. "Expropriation" does not seem to figure any more in the program of the "revolutionary" Socialist party, altho the patient voter is still lured into the belief that capitalism will be mercilessly "expropriated" so soon as a sufficient number have voted for Socialism. Why, then, should the workers not help themselves to food and other necessaries of life in time of a strike? Does the majority of *voters* make "expropriation" any more legitimate than the majority of *strikers?*

INTERLOPER.

—o—

From Many Lands.

The publishers of *Lucifer*, the champions of sex freedom, have decided to counteract the persecution of the postal officials by raising its subscription price to $2. a year and mail the paper at the third-class rate of postage.

The Chicago Federation of labor is arranging a mass-meeting to protest against the arrest of John Turner, and the comrades who wish to attend the meeting should watch the daily papers, in which the date and place of the demonstration will be announced.

The Brooklyn Federation of Labor, in a special meeting, protested emphatically against the detention of John Turner at Ellis Island. and held a public protest meeting January 3. The New York Central Federated Union is also going to hold a protest meeting, of which details have not been reported thus far.

The Los Angeles (Cal.) city council recently enacted an ordinance forbidding any person from delivering a speech on the street or in public parks. Immediately a Free Speech League was organized and the ordinance deliberately violated, and the law is now a dead letter. This again shows how much more effective individual initiative is than the ballot-box.

Some members of the Chicago Federation of Labor have gathered the opinions of men who have distinguished themselves by their writings on sociology, as to the causes of panics, which the employers have attributed to organized labor. Among the men who have given their views on the problem are Peter Kropotkin, Edward Carpenter, Geo. D. Herron, Lawson, M. Purdy, John Burns, Ernest H. Crosby, William Lloyd Garrison, Geo. Francis Train, Sir Charles Dilke, and others, all more or less agreeing that industrial depressions are caused by the unequal distribution of wealth—the system of exploitation which deprives the workers of the power to consume—hence the "panics." Comrade Kropotkin adds;

> There is a great chance for a book to be printed upon the relations of capital and labor in America. I should be glad to write a general treatise upon the matter if proper material could be forwarded to me.

The committee which had been corresponding with the above mentioned individuals, concluded the report, saying its own "beliefs coincided with those of the writen letters," and "that the conditions rendering industrial panics possible are bolstered up by the private ownership of land, the private ownership of social production, and the power of taxation." The Federation of Labor decided to publish in pamphlet form all the correspondence, and asked that it be discussed in each local union.

The Socialist light of France, Jaures, attacked in his journal the *Vorwärts*, party organ of the Social Democrats in Germany, and the latter retorts by exposing some of the sins "Comrade Jaures" is guilty of, which are in no way encouraging to the dupes who still cherish the idea of a "Socialist administration of things," otherwise called government. According to this German Socialist daily, Jaures voted against the resolution which demanded the withdrawal of the troops from a strike region he participated at the banquet given in honor of the Italian royal couple; when in the chamber of deputies the wanton attack of the police on the workers in the streets of Paris was discussed, Jaures moved the matter be laid on the table, as the stability of the ministry was at stake (sic), and he also voted for the (secret fund) which is appropriated for the spying of labor and other radical movements. These are samples of political action.

Herbert Spencer.

(Concluded from last week.)

It is remarkable that in all his writings there is not, so far as I remember, even an allusion to the theory of logic except where he blames Comte for making it the key-note to his harmony of the sciences, because, Spencer says, logic is not a science but a mere blank form illustrating that method abstracted from the sciences, to which it is common. I should demur to this.

The fundamental instincts of purposeless activity, seen even in a rhizopod—"the play-instinct, is the creative instinct." All others diverge from it. But its pure form, in beings of generalizing intelligence, is Fine Art. The instincts second in fundamental character, hunger, love, and such complications as acquisitiveness, seek gratification in modes largely requiring acquaintance with objective nature, and thus give rise to Useful Art. Directed very largely also on that part of nature which, differing somewhat from either Subjectivity or Objectivity, has been called the Eject, they induce also Aristotle's "Volition to Persuade." The "Volition to Know" is associated with all, but reaches its height at a somewhat early stage of culture—with intelligent youth and half-civilized nations, as Macaulay observed. Now each of these purposes has its own "logic," or technique. The "Volition to Know" induces abstract and metaphysical reasoning, whose method is well called Formal Logic, and whose only connecting link with the Useful Arts is mathematics. For the rest, the intellectual product of these arts is Physical Science, whose method is induction. The technique of the Persuasive Art is Rhetoric, according to the original comprehensive sense. That of the Beautiful Arts never has been, perhaps cannot be, reduced to formula; yet in a great measure this has been done for parts of it—the theory of music e. g.—out of harmonies among which parts are generalized the somewhat conflicting systems of Esthetics. It may be remarked, *en passant*, that Spencer, by various Essays—"Gracefulness," "Origin and Function of Music," "Philosophy of Laughter," etc., has done much towards placing these on an inductive and evolutionary basis.

Now, if the different volitions give rise to different kinds of art, or reasoned effort, each with a peculiar method, logic, or technique, then logic in general is no blank form of scientific reasoning, but itself a complex product of Evolution, which ought moreover to come first in a "Subjective Philosophy," as Spencer sometimes called his own. It is of practical importance to begin any undertaking by deciding what we propose to do and how to set about it. Neglect of this preliminary is really a weak point in his scheme. An undue part of the "Principles of Morality" is devoted to dialectical championship of an ethical theory essentially metaphysical and very old. But the only progressive method (outside mathematics) is the inductive; and even in mathematics formal logic contributes to human welfare only as it aids induction. How differently Bacon would have Ethics treated! He, as Macaulay reminds us, never meddled with those enigmas which have puzzled hundreds of generations and will puzzle hundreds more. He said nothing about the grounds of moral obligation or the freedom of the human will. He had no inclination to engage in labors like those of the damned in the Grecian Tartarus; to spin forever on the same revolving wheel, to gape forever after the same deluding clusters, to draw water forever with the same bottomless buckets, to roll the same recoiling stone up the same weary hill. He exhorted his disciples to regard morality as a practical science, which aims to cure the disorders of the mind, and must be improved by methods like those which have improved medicine and surgery. Ascertain what effects are actually produced on character by society, studies, emulation, and other causes; then you will be in a way to learn how moral health may really be preserved or restored. If the moral and social future belongs, as we believe, to Anarchy, the moral and social significance of a philosopher depends on what he does to promote Anarchy. Spencer did a great deal; but he lost an unequaled opportunity when he founded his "Principles of Morality" on the "volition to persuade" Philistine practice by eudæmonistic theory.

Not dissimilarly, in his "Principles of Sociology," he fails to improve as well as even Buckle, a better opportunity for the same great purpose. Buckle shows that law and government have always done harm, so effectively that his feeble disclaimer of wanting them totally abolished does very little. Spencer shows the same in his "Over Legistion," the first edition of his "Social Statics," and elsewhere; and upon this his importance to Anarchism rests. But his formula that "every man has a right to do as he pleases provided he does not invade the equal rights of others," is a metaphysical old maid—as Bacon unjustly said of pure mathematics "a virgin consecrated to God which can bear no fruit." That it should be embraced by Anarchists is a melancholy outrage, and yet laughable in its own way.

"Some odd mistakes too happened in the dark,
"Which showed a want of lanterns, or of taste."

The aged individualistic truth will bring forth nothing but words; in which, like the rest of the venerably chaste, she is tolerably prolific. The fruitful thought of Anarchism is not that every man "ought" to mind his own business; but that organizations for the purpose of making people do so never set any example but a bad one. And Spencer knew this so well that he really was an Anarchist, as his French critics, familiar with Anarchism, saw at once. Like Buckle, he tried to disclaim it, but in a different way. His excuse for being "afraid of his horses" amounted to this, that, tho laws and government do only harm, they must exist while they are supposed to do good. And of course this is true. But it dictates so forcibly the duty of exposing their fallacy that his mutilation of his "Social Statics" is much to be regretted. In the "Principles of Psychology" again, the metaphysical portion could not only well be spared, but it seems to have had a confusing effect on later psychologists of the evolutionary school, like William James, who complains that metaphysics cannot be kept out of psychology, tho they always upset the coach. They can be kept out very easily if we will start with and stick to the postulate that Consciousness, meaning by that not feeling but a capacity for feeling, is inherent in protoplasm. This assumption once made, the subsequent development of Mind becomes traceable by induction along lines indicated by the hypothesis of Evolution. Of course the assumption is wholly unwarranted by the Volition to Know in which metaphysical reasoning begins. But the sphere of positive science and inductive reason is the Volition to Do or Make. Inductive science is the technique of the Useful Arts. Forget that, to go speculating on how protoplasm came to be endowed with consciousness, and you let in a "pygmy folly"—

"The faithless guest will stamp the enchanted ground
And mingled forms of misery rise around."

Is not all matter endowed with consciousness? Is there any such thing as matter? If so, what sort of a thing is it? It is infinitely divisible or finitely? Is a Hyle needed to the Pleroma? Is not a Pleroma just as necessary to a Hyle? Then how can either be "afore or after other?" Is the Substance one, and are the Hypostases three? "You can and you can't; you shall and you shan't; you will and you won't; and you'll be damned if you don't." All this unquestionably does burst, like a transformation scene, into psychology, the moment we admit an "ultimate question." *And so it does into anything else*,—into Anarchism, for example, when you go to discussing "Rights" instead of Mights. But all this could be avoided by first recognizing the divisions of logic founded on the purposes they respectively set out with.

That "ultimate questions" are unprogressive and insoluble was indeed known to no man any better than to Herbert Spencer. The chapters on "The Unknowable" in his "First Principles," are doubtless the most exhaustive refutation in the world of the fundamental metaphysical postulate; that to Know anything, otherwise than as an implication of something else, is possible. He was not, however, satisfied that his work should be limited to giving Science a permanent direction, ambitious as that project was. He aspired to the rank of Seer and Prophet. Nor does it seem to have occurred to him, as it did to Matthew Arnold, that that very suicide of Desire which occurs in all its phases, from the grossest animal propensity to the plunge of Sophia in the Bythos, is the subjects of Beautiful Art; so that Religion, with the renunciation which it teaches, is the highest form of creative imagination. The doctrine which he held up "at once supremely scientific and supremely religious" was only that knowledge of God is unattainable; not that its pursuit is that object which does give thru out life and might furnish thru eternity increasing foretastes of the beatific vision. The school of Comte, so defective in other particulars, had an advantage over him here, which was brought out in his seemingly forgotten controversy with Frederick Harrison. The Comteist's object of worship, Humanity, is confessed not to be his *Grand Etre Supreme*. But though only one of the manifestations of the Supreme, it can be worshipped, as such, for it is something. The Unknowabl

of Spencer cannot be worshipped because, as Harrison said, it is not a conceivable object but an algebraical symbol, "x to the power of n," which means what is common to all things, that is No Thing. It was, indeed, among those vaguenesses in which Spencer's thought, having overshot its limit of coherence, lost itself, that this Infinite Nothing in Particular is the inscrutable cause of the highest good. But the highest good set forth in the "Principles of Morality" is not a very lofty good. Kropotkin ("Anarchism and Modern Science") remarked it as a defect in Spencer's genius that he had too little sympathy for human passions to appreciate their "purification" in the form of art. Similarly, tho his Agnosticism is sharply distinguishable from Materialism—tho he goes so far, in the "Principles of Psychology," as to say that between Materialism and Idealism, the latter has the case; and tho in the Appendix to his "First Principles," he defends, accordingly, against the doctrine of Energy reciprocal between bodies, that of Force acting upon space, which Faraday's experiments have placed on an inductive basis, yet, in the necessity of conceiving his "Reality" either as Subject or Object, Mind or Matter, he usually prefers the latter—his system is "Transfigured" Realism (materialism); his proof that the Power manifest subjectively and objectively is One, turns on this, that dead matter assimilated by living becomes Mind, with the inference frequently allowed, that Mind, however inconceivably, is extracted from and absorbed again in Matter. The revelations of Psychical Research he had doubtless reason enough for ignoring; but the reason he gave was not a good one—he had settled such questions already "upon subjective grounds."

Every one knows that Herbert Spencer died a bachelor. It may not be known generally that there was a romance in his life. The woman he would have married—probably the only one then living worthy of him—was widely known by the masculine pseudonym of George Eliot. What stood between them was their religion. "George Eliot," perhaps the most brilliant interpreter of Comte, would doubtless have admitted Darwin's theory of human origin to be probably true. But her worship of Humanity made her regard it as a very disagreeable truth, to be treated for all esthetic purposes in an obscurantist spirit; while to her great admirer it was the most signal demonstration how beneficient is Evolution.

"Tautum religio potuit suadere malorum!"

If these great spirits had been enlarged to the full measure of Anarchism, which both came so near, what exquisite harmony there might have been in such an antithesis!

The importance of Spencer to science thus lies in propounding an hypothesis which, tho as one-sided as that of Democritus, is doubtless more comprehensively useful than any originating since Democritus' time. His importance to Anarchism, we have intimated, is in the thought more or less pervading all his works, that "Individuation"—a term of his own—is the end of Evolution. But in "the choir invisible of those immortal dead who live again in lives made better by their presence" his still higher significance will be expressed thru the consecrated zeal with which his own individuality achieved his personal mission, after so many years of labor undertaken at first with little hope to see the end, in defiance of "censure rash," and without expectation of other recompense than the sense of duty done.

C. L. JAMES.

—— o ——

Regarding Maud Starne's Suggestion.

I have often discussed the question of freedom with women; but I never heard them say that they lacked moral support in their effort to gain freedom and independence. What I did hear them say was that they were not able to make a living.

It seems to me that a well poised individual would live up to his or her convictions, even if there were not another person in existence with the same opinions. So long as men or women do not have the idea of freedom in all its aspects at heart, so long will they submit to any falsehood fostered by society or government.

I as a woman do not care whether or not there are others with the same convictions as mine. All I need is convictions, and I will live up to then, even if all the world in its ignorance is against me. I have no objection to opening a correspondence with those who are in doubt as to whether they are right; but I do not believe that half convinced women will become fully convinced if they do know that there are a few others.

LYDIA LANDOW.

—— o ——

To B. Sachatoff.

I am sorry that B. Sachatoff does not know of the existence of such a thing as inference; hence his assertion of my misunderstanding him. Is it not self-evident that only an adherent of the non resistance theory can argue against the stand comrades are taking in Turner's case? The speakers at the New York protest meeting were not Anarchists; consequently it was not to be expected that our ideal would be propagated by them—yet Anarchists availed themselves of this opportunity, as signify the many newspaper reports about their meetings.

Again in vain does Sachatoff fear that the Supreme Court may declare the law in question unconstitutional, or not applicable to such "harmless" men as Comrade Turner. The Supreme Court is generally not any too antagonistic to the tendencies of lower courts and in all probability it will make no exception in a case where such "aliens" as Anarchists are involved.

Try as I may, I fail to see any connection between the desire to be hanged for an ideal and resistance as a principle of action. The fact is that Tolstoy *does* propagate non-resistance and simultaneously *does* have the ambition to be hanged for an ideal—the two being not necessarily incompatible. That thousands of peasants resist military service, because of ther adherence to Tolstoism, serves to prove the contradiction of the latter's teaching in its practical application: people who believe in no-resistance actually do resist this or that governmental decree!

Last, but not least, comes the familiar platform phrase, calculated to produce an immediate effect upon the audience, viz., that freedom is just as much of a myth in the United States as in Russia, etc., etc. In my opinion it is preposterous to assert that America can be compared with barbarous Russia, so far as freedom of speech and press is concerned. True, we Anarchists are not satisfied with but a portion, nevertheless, it is a fact that we have something at least of that precious material, and strive for more of it—at any rate, we do not feel inclined to lose it. The apathy of the American public towards any kind of a progressive movement is tracable to various and more complicated cases than the supposed illusion of ever becoming "presidents," etc., there are a very few of such dunces nowadays.

In conclusion, let me add, that I will refrain from further discussing this subject.

BERTHA LEIB.

—— o ——

Echoes.

At the sight of a great work of art one's heart is stricken with the melancholy thought, "How few are permitted to enjoy the beautiful things which the genius and hands of man have created." Millions and millions live dull and sad, never bathing the soul for a single time in elevated enjoyments; never made happy by nature's creations. The never-ending drudgery of everyday life, lieying heavily upon them, does not permit them to search out the places where true art may receive their homage. Does there not lay therein a deep and shameful reproach to those who, from the height of their culture, constitute the height of the human race? Do artists really produce only for a chosen few, whose wealth has placed them, spiritually and mentally, above the rest in capacity for enjoyment? Should not a share in their work be opened to all? The capitalistic class, shocked by such a question, shake the head haughtily. They know further, how to maintain the enjoyment of art as the prerogative of their privileged class. Socialism (in its broadest sense) only can bring about a remedy. It intends to draw all together for mutual and useful work, and give to all the opportunity to share the joy of the beautiful.—*Martin Drescher.*

—— o ——

New York, Attention!

The new group of New York, the Radical Club, has arranged a theater performance for the benefit of FREE SOCIETY, which will take place on Thursday, Feb. 4, 1904, 8 p. m., in Thalia theater, 46 Bowery. The well known and attractive play, the Jewish Sappho, will be performed by Mrs. Calsh and the other best actors of the house. Comrade Emma Goldman will speak between the acts on "The English Propaganda."

Tickets can be got from the following:
Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St.
M. Maisel's bookstore, 194 E. Broadway
Herrick Bros., 141 Division St.
Parnes & Katz Café, 167 E. Broadway.
H. Nack's Barbershop, 79 Clinton St.
The Manhattan Café, 90 Manhattan Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

All comrades are cordially invited to aid the club by selling tickets. H. COMAROW.

—— o ——

For Cleveland.

"Free Society" meets every Sunday 2: 30 p. m., in Foresters' Hall, 223 Champlain St. All friends of liberty are cordially invited.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for FREE SOCIETY can be paid at the following addresses:

ALLEGHENY Pa.—H. Bauer 73 Springgarden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N, J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON —K. A. Snellenberg, 127 Center St., Roxbury.
BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 34 Elwell St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—M. Maisel, 194 E. B'way.
PHILADELPHIA.—Natasha Notkin, 1332 S. Sixth St.

RECEIPTS.

Kisliuk, $2. Herman, Palme, Simone, Schwelm, Haluschka, Boecklein, Cullen, Jung, Blum, Tuttle, Kent, Evans, each $1. Fay, Rudolph, each 50c.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Translated from the Russian by David A. Modell.)

Considered by some Kropotkin's best work.

Well and tastefully printed on good paper in clear and large type. 94 pages.

CONTENTS:

. Two Fundamental Tendencies in Society. The Kinship of Anarchism and the Popular Creative Tendency.

II. The Intellectual Movement of the Eighteenth Century: Its fundamental traits; the investigation of all phenomena by the scientific method. The Stagnation of Thought at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. The Awakening of Socialism: Its Influence upon the Development of Science. The Fifties.

III. Auguste Comte's Attempt to build up a Synthetic Philosophy. The causes of his failure. The religious explanation of the moral sense in man.

IV. The Flowering of the exact Sciences in 1856-62. The Development of the Mechanical World—Conception, embracing the Development of Human Ideas and Institutions. A Theory of Evolution.

V. The Possibility of a New Synthetic Philosophy. Herbert Spencer's Attempt; Why it failed. The Methodnot sustained. A false conception of "The Struggle for Existence."

VI. The Causes of this Mistake. The Teaching of the Church: "the World is steeped in Sin." The Government's inculcation of the same view of "Man's Radical Perversity." The Views of Modern Anthropology upon this subject. The Development of forms of Life by the "Masses," and the Law. Its Twofold Character.

VII. The place of Anarchism in Science. Its endeavor to formulate a Synthetic Conception of the World.—Its Object.

VIII. Its origin How its Ideal is developed by the Natural-Scientific Method.

IX. A Brief Summary of the Conclusions Reached by Anarchism: Law. Morality. Economic Ideas. The Government.

X. Continuation: Methods of Action. The Understanding of Revolutions and their Birth. The Creative Ingenuity of the People. Conclusion.

Price, 25 cents

Send orders to NatashaNotkin, 1332 S. Sixth St., Philadelphia, Pa.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism....Grant Allen	05
God and the State.....Bakunin	05
The Same. London edition.....	10
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings.....Helena Born	1.00
Prodigal Daughter: or, The Price of Virtue.....Rachel Campbell	25
Love's Coming of Age.....Edward Carpenter	1.00
Evolution of the Family.....Jonathan Mayo Crane	05
Conduct and Profession.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
Crime and Criminals..... "	10
Realism in Literature and Art.. "	05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth..... "	75
Tolstoy..... "	10
Crime and Punishment.....Voltairine de Cleyre	10
The Worm Turns..... "	10
The Emancipation of Society from Government.....Dallan Doyle	05
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism.....Jay Fox	03
Moribund Society and Anarchy. Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave	25
Origin of Anarchism....C. L. James	05
The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. (An excellent work to disillusionize those Social Democrats, who still imagine that Socialists contemplate a Revolution.) 180 pages.....	50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles ..... "	05
An Appeal to the Young..... "	05
Anarchist Morality..... "	05
Expropriation..... "	05
Field, Factory and Workshop "	45
Law and Authority..... "	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist..... "	2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor of Evolution..... "	2.00
Organized Vengeance..... "	03
Paris Commune..... "	05
The State: Its Historic Role..... "	10
The Wage System. Revolutionary Government..... "	05
Socialism and Politics..... "	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	50
The Economics of Anarchy.....Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.)....Malatesta	10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers... "	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....Octave Mirbeau	50
Do You Want Free Speech?.....James F. Morton, Jr.	10
The Deistic Pestilence...John Most	05
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition...W. Nevill	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....F. Domela Nieuweuhuis	05
A Cityless and Countryless World: An Outline of Practical Cooperative Individualism Cloth $1.....Henry Olerich	50
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
Sine Qua Non, or The Core of Religion.....Dr. Geo. Pyburn	10
Evolution and Revolution...Reclus	05
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell	10
Pages of Socialist History.....W. Tcherkesoff	30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.....Leo Tolstoy	75
Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses.....E. C. Walker	15
Vice: Its Friends and Foes..... "	15
What the Young Need to Know "	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth $1.50.....J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth. "	1.05
The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab.....	25

Order from Mary Dick, 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

M. N. MAISEL'S BOOKSTORE

194 EAST BROADWAY - - NEW YORK

The best ten plays of HENRIK IBSEN.

A Doll's House,	25c.
Rosmerholm,	25c.
The Lady of the Sea,	25c.
The Wild Duck,	25c.
Young Men's League,	25c.
Hedda Gabler,	50c.
The Master Builder,	50c.
The Pillars of Society,	25c.
Ghosts,	25c
The Enemy of Society,	25c.

The last three plays named, are also published in a cheap edition in one volume, cloth, and sold at 30c. or 40c. postpaid.

The above ten plays, paper, sent to one address, postpaid, for $2.50.

The same ten plays, seven in paper, together with the last three in one cloth volume, sent postpaid for $2.25.

I have on hand a few new sets of the complete works of

LEO TOLSTOY,

in twelve volumes, good print and fine binding, published at $12, which I will sell, while they last, at $9.50 a set. The expressage must be paid by the buyer.

A well selected stock of more than 5,000 volumes on philosophy, history, sociology, free thought, the labor movement, modern literature and drama always on hand.

German and Russian books imported.

Good prices paid for collections of radical books and periodicals.

(Second Edition)

THE LIFE OF ALBERT R. PARSONS

WITH A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE

ANARCHIST TRIAL

and a brief history of the

LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

Also Sketches of the Lives of A. Spies, A. Fischer, Geo. Engel, and Louis Lingg. Gov. J P. Altgeld's "Reasons for Pardoning the Anarchists"

With splendid portraits of the Eight condemned men, and other illustrations.

Price, cloth, $1. Postage, 25 cents,

Order from the publisher, Mrs. LUCY E. PARSONS, 1777 N. Troy St., Chicago, Ill.

WANTED.

One hundred women to study midwifery. Register now for session beginning Jan. 1st.

Address

DR. F. E. DRESSLER,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE & SURGERY
245 Ashland Boul. Chicago.

History of the French Revolution.

BY C. L. JAMES.

A new history of the French Revolution, and a history writen from a new point of view—this is in little a characterization of a work which is exciting intelligent interest and appreciative criticism among historical scholars and readers of history in general.

The author of the work, C. L. James, is in a literary as well as the physical sense the son of his father, G. R. James; who was well-known, both as a scholar and imaginative writer to an older generation of book-lovers. With a trained literary faculty, an unbiased judgment, and a capacity for painstaking investigation and emendation, he has produced a piece of writing which cannot fail to become better and better known as time goes on, and which will take a place among authoritative pronouncements upon those events which it chronicles.

C. L. James approaches the problem of the French Revolution in a thoroly scientific spirit, and conciliates opposition at once by giving due consideration to all the facts having any importance in that memorable strife. Butere the reader has gone very far into the book he discovers that it is a vindication of the human race in its long, long struggle to free itself from restrictions upon its liberty and life; in short, he discovers that the author views the evil of the French Revolution as a thing arising mainly out of oppression prior thereto and authoritative interference during its progress, and the good as those liberties which it gave to the world and which its ideal and example predispose men to augment according to their strength and individuality.

Monarchic, democratic, religious histories we have had; the French Revolution is now presented to us from a libertarian point of view.

Printed from large, new type on good book paper, and handsomely bound in cloth; 343 pp. Price $1, postpaid.

Order from Abe Isaak Jr. ,407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

SOME APPRECIATIONS.

All must be attracted by your forceful and pointed way of putting your matter. I thoroly enjoy your reading of this great world movement.—Prof. G. R. MOULTON, University of Chicago.

I was much interested in looking over the work. It seems to me to indicate careful study of the sources, and to be the work of one profoundly interested in democracy.—AZARIAH S. ROOT, Librarian Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio.

It presents a point of view which entitles it to more than passing consideration.—*The Public*, Chicago.

It shows ripe scholarship and a profound knowledge of the subject, which is the greatest in the history of the world. It is original and is written in Mr. James' terse, vigorous style. . . . For the ordinary reader it is much better than Carlyle's famous work. It is certainly most creditable to its scholarly author.—*Daily Leader*, Eau Claire, Wis.

Carlyle gave us the English of the Revolution. Thiers gave us the French of the Revolution: the conventional French. But it has remained for more modern criticism to render up the Revolution to its larger meanings. James belongs to that criticism.—*The Conservator*, Philadelphia.